

Non-full rank bound entangled states satisfying the range criterion

Somshubhro Bandyopadhyay*, Sibasish Ghosh[†], and Vwani Roychowdhury[‡]
Department of Electrical Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095

A systematic method for generating bound entangled states in any bipartite system, with ranks ranging from five to full rank, is presented. These states are constructed by mixing separable states with UPB (Unextendible Product Basis) -generated PPT bound entangled states. A subset of this class of PPT bound entangled states, having less than full rank, is shown to satisfy the range criterion [*Phys. Lett. A* **232** (1997) 333].

PACS numbers: 03.67.Hk, 03.65.Bz, 89.70.+c

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the recent fundamental advances in quantum information theory [1], and in particular in the theory of quantum entanglement [2], is the discovery of bound entangled states [3]: the mixed entangled states from which no pure entanglement can be obtained by local operations and classical communication (LOCC), whatever be the number of copies of the state being shared. Bound entangled (BE) states have been studied extensively in the recent past [4, 5, 6], and the primary focus has been on obtaining succinct characterizations of bound entangled states, on deriving appropriate tools to identify bound entanglement, and on enumerating possible applications of bound entangled states, if any, for quantum information processing purposes. A comprehensive understanding of BE states, however, still remains elusive. For example, while a few systematic procedures for constructing BE states that are positive under partial transposition (i.e., PPT BE states) have been presented [4, 5, 6], the relative abundance and distribution of PPT BE states in the Hilbert space is still not completely understood.

Perhaps the main difficulty in studying bound entangled states is related to its identification. The problem is complicated by the fact that most bound entangled states are positive under partial transposition, like any separable state; the existence of BE states that might be negative under partial transposition (NPT) has only been conjectured [7]. Thus a major challenge in identifying and characterizing BE states concerns itself with the question of whether a given PPT state is separable or inseparable. In general, despite recent efforts [8], there are no succinct criteria or efficient computational tools that would determine a separable decomposition of any given PPT state, if it exists, or otherwise would indicate that

no such decomposition is possible. An ingenious technique to get around this hurdle is based on studying the *range* of the state under consideration [3]. Recall that the range of a Hermitian operator is the space spanned by the eigenvectors corresponding to the non-zero eigenvalues. The *range criterion* of separability (RC) can be stated as follows: If a state ρ_{AB} acting on a Hilbert space is separable, then there exists a family of product vectors $|\psi_i\rangle_A \otimes |\phi_i\rangle_B$ such that (a) they span the range of ρ_{AB} (b) the vectors $|\psi_i\rangle_A \otimes |\phi_i^*\rangle_B$ span the range of ρ^{T_B} (where the superscript T_B represents the partial transposition operation with respect to party B , and $*$ denotes the complex conjugation in the basis where the partial transposition was performed,). In particular, $|\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i\rangle$ belongs to the range of ρ . It is to be mentioned here that the separability problem (i.e., to test whether any given state of a composite system is separable) has been shown to be NP-hard [9]. Recently Doherty et al. [10] has provided a complete family of separability criteria for detecting whether a given state of a composite system is separable or entangled. This method is based on the possibility of extending the state to a state of more number of parties, satisfying some symmetry conditions. For all separable states, such extensions are always possible, but if a state is entangled, it will definitely lack this possibility – the fact, which can be detected after a finitely many steps in the hierarchy of separability criteria. And this extension method can be cast as a semi-definite programming [11]. Also it has been shown recently by Perez-Garcia [12] that the cross-norm characterization of separability, a necessary and sufficient criterion for testing separability (given by Rudolph [13]), can be reduced to a linear programming problem, for fixed chosen error.

The RC is of course a necessary condition for separability, *but if a state violates the criterion it must be entangled*. Most systematic procedures for constructing PPT BE states, presented so far, are based on showing that the underlying *PPT states violate the RC*. For example, the first systematic way to construct PPT BE states was provided in Ref. [5] based on the concept of unextendible product bases, where the BE states violate the RC in an extreme way, in the sense that there are no product states in its range. The range criterion, however, cannot always be applied. If the given state is of full rank then it trivially satisfies the range criterion. Indeed, in Ref. [14] the authors constructed a class of full rank PPT states in $3 \otimes 3$ quantum systems, which are

*Present address: Department of Chemistry, University of Toronto, 80 St. George St., Toronto, ON, M5S3H6, Canada

[†]Present address: Department of Computer Science, The University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK

[‡]Electronic address: som,vwani@ee.ucla.edu, sibasish@cs.york.ac.uk

entangled. In fact, all classes of bound entangled states that have been obtained so far, either (1) violate the RC and are of less than full rank or (2) are of full rank (only such known class is the one in $3 \otimes 3$, mentioned above).

One question is imminent: *Does their exist PPT BE states that do not have full rank but nevertheless satisfy the RC ? Moreover, can one find a systematic procedure to obtain PPT BE states that satisfy the RC ?*

The answers to the above questions are not immediately clear. It is also not known whether there are full-rank PPT BE states in any $d \otimes d$ system. In our effort to identify PPT BE states that satisfy the RC, the theory of non decomposable positive maps and entanglement witness turns out to be extremely useful. The witness operators to detect bound entanglement was first introduced for UPB-generated BE states in Ref. [15], and was developed further in Ref. [16].

The present work addresses the construction and identification of both non-full rank and full-rank PPT BE states that *satisfy* the RC in any $d \otimes d$ bipartite quantum system. First, in Section II, we use the UPB states in $3 \otimes 3$ from Ref. [17] to construct a class of PPT BE states that have rank 5 (while the system has rank 9). We prove their inseparability *from the first principles*, i.e., by showing that the bound entangled states cannot be written as a convex combination of the pure product states in it's support, even though the support admits an orthogonal product basis. In Section III, we generalize the results for $3 \otimes 3$ and show that *for any $d \otimes d$ bipartite quantum system, there are PPT bound entangled states of rank r , where $d^2 - 4 \leq r \leq d^2$, satisfying the range criterion*. In fact, we show that a much larger set of BE states, which includes such RC-satisfying BE states as a subset, can be constructed as convex combinations of a UPB-generated BE state and a separable state, which is a projector on the space spanned by a subset of the UPB's. A proof of inseparability of these states is obtained by constructing an appropriate entanglement witness, which allows us to explicitly calculate well-defined ranges of the parameter used in convex combination, such that all states in the range are PPT BE. This construction leads to a new class of PPT BE states in any $d \otimes d$ bipartite system, with rank ranging from 5 to d^2 ; only a subset of this is proven to satisfy the RC. Note that this construction also yields *full-rank PPT BE states in any $d \otimes d$ bipartite quantum system*.

II. NON-FULL-RANK BE STATES IN $3 \otimes 3$ SATISFYING THE RC

We first show inseparability of a set of non-full rank PPT states in $3 \otimes 3$ that satisfy the range criterion in a direct way. The proof relies on the fact that the state cannot be written as a convex combination of the pure product states in it's support *even though the support can be spanned by an orthogonal set of pure product states*, and there are more product states than the dimension

of the support. Let $\{|\omega_1\rangle, |\omega_2\rangle, |\omega_3\rangle, |\omega_4\rangle, |\omega_5\rangle\}$, be the UPB in $3 \otimes 3$ constructed in Ref. [17]:

$$\begin{aligned} |\omega_1\rangle &= |2\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle - |2\rangle); |\omega_2\rangle = |0\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle), \\ |\omega_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \otimes |2\rangle; |\omega_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle - |2\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle, \\ |\omega_5\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle + |2\rangle) \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle + |2\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Let

$$\rho_{BE} = \frac{1}{4} \left(I - \sum_{i=1}^5 |\omega_i\rangle \langle \omega_i| \right) \quad (2)$$

be the associated bound entangled state. We now show that the states,

$$\rho_i(\Omega) = \Omega |\omega_i\rangle \langle \omega_i| + (1 - \Omega) \rho_{BE} \quad (3)$$

for any i ($1 \leq i \leq 5$) have the following properties:

- (i) They are *bound entangled states* if and only if $0 \leq \Omega < \frac{1}{5}$.
- (ii) They *satisfy the range criterion*, i.e., the range of $\rho_i(\Omega)$ is spanned by an orthogonal product basis $\{|\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i\rangle : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$, and that of $(\rho_i(\Omega))^{T_B}$ is spanned by the product basis $\{|\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i^*\rangle : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$, and
- (iii) The range of $\rho_i(\Omega)$ contains *more pure product states than its dimension*: In fact, there are exactly six product pure states in the range.

Let us first start with the case $i = 1$. Since,

$$\rho_{BE} = \frac{1}{4} \left(I - |\omega_1\rangle \langle \omega_1| - \sum_{i=2}^5 |\omega_i\rangle \langle \omega_i| \right) \quad (4)$$

one obtains,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1(\Omega) &= \frac{5\Omega - 1}{4} |\omega_1\rangle \langle \omega_1| \\ &+ \frac{5(1 - \Omega)}{4} \left[\frac{1}{5} \left(I - \sum_{i=2}^5 |\omega_i\rangle \langle \omega_i| \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We show below that one can find *five* mutually orthogonal pure product states in the range of the rank five projector

$$\left(I - \sum_{i=2}^5 |\omega_i\rangle \langle \omega_i| \right) \quad (6)$$

and therefore, the state

$$\frac{1}{5} \left(I - \sum_{i=2}^5 |\omega_i\rangle \langle \omega_i| \right) \quad (7)$$

is separable. This also implies that for all Ω , such that $\frac{1}{5} \leq \Omega \leq 1$, $\rho_1(\Omega)$ is a convex combination of separable states and, hence is a separable state itself.

The first part involves counting explicitly the number of *pure* product states in the support of $\rho_1(\Omega)$ which we

show that there are only six of them. The proof of inseparability will then follow by showing that $\rho_1(\Omega)$ cannot be expressed as a convex combination of the product states in its support when $0 \leq \Omega < \frac{1}{5}$.

Let H_S be the subspace spanned by the UPB, let $\{|\chi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^4$ be a set of pairwise orthonormal vectors spanning the orthogonal subspace $H_S^\perp$, which is the range of the state ρ_{BE} . Let A be the new subspace spanned by the vectors $\{|\chi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^4$ and $|\omega_1\rangle$. The support of the density operators $\rho_1(\Omega)$ is therefore nothing but the subspace A .

Any pure product state in $3 \otimes 3$ can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle = (\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle + \gamma|2\rangle) \otimes (\alpha'|0\rangle + \beta'|1\rangle + \gamma'|2\rangle), \quad (8)$$

where the coefficients are complex and satisfy the normalization conditions

$$|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 + |\gamma|^2 = |\alpha'|^2 + |\beta'|^2 + |\gamma'|^2 = 1. \quad (9)$$

If $|\psi\rangle \in A$, we must have $\langle\psi|\omega_i\rangle = 0$, for $i = 2, \dots, 5$. Using the orthogonality and normalization conditions one can show that there can be only six pure product states in A , including $|\omega_1\rangle$. The five other pure product states,

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle - |2\rangle) \otimes |1\rangle, \\ |\eta_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle + |2\rangle) \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle), \\ |\eta_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(2|0\rangle - |1\rangle - |2\rangle) \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle), \\ |\eta_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle + |2\rangle) \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle - 2|2\rangle), \\ |\eta_5\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle - 2|2\rangle) \otimes |2\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

are mutually orthogonal and form a basis in A . Let us write $|\eta_i\rangle = |\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i\rangle$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$. From Eq. (5) we see that $|\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i\rangle = |\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i^*\rangle$, as for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$, $|\phi_i\rangle$ is a real state. Since in this case $\rho_1(\Omega) = (\rho_1(\Omega))^{T_B}$, and $\{|\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i\rangle : i = 1, 2, \dots, 5\}$ spans the range of $\rho_1(\Omega)$, therefore $\{|\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i^*\rangle : i = 1, 2, \dots, 5\}$ spans the range of $(\rho_1(\Omega))^{T_B}$. Thus we see that $\rho_1(\Omega)$ satisfies the range criterion for all $0 \leq \Omega \leq 1$.

Next, let us consider the case where $0 < \Omega < \frac{1}{5}$ and let us suppose that the state $\rho_1(\Omega)$ is separable. Then it must be expressed by the convex combination of the pure product states in its support, which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1(\Omega) &= \Omega |\omega_1\rangle \langle\omega_1| + (1 - \Omega) \rho_{BE} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^5 \eta_i |\eta_i\rangle \langle\eta_i| + \omega_1 |\omega_1\rangle \langle\omega_1|, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\omega_1, \eta_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, 5$. Substituting the expression for ρ_{BE} from Eq. (5), and noting that

$$I - \sum_{i=2}^5 |\omega_i\rangle \langle\omega_i| = \sum_{i=1}^5 |\eta_i\rangle \langle\eta_i| \quad (12)$$

one obtains

$$\frac{5\Omega - 1}{4} |\omega_1\rangle \langle\omega_1| + \frac{1 - \Omega}{4} \sum |\eta_i\rangle \langle\eta_i| = \sum \eta_i |\eta_i\rangle \langle\eta_i| + \omega_1 |\omega_1\rangle \langle\omega_1|. \quad (13)$$

If $\Omega < \frac{1}{5}$, then we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^5 \eta'_i |\eta_i\rangle \langle\eta_i| = \beta |\omega_1\rangle \langle\omega_1|,$$

where $\beta > 0$ and at least one $\eta'_k \neq 0$ ($1 \leq k \leq 5$). Since $\langle\eta_i|\eta_j\rangle = \delta_{ij}$ and $\langle\eta_i|\omega_1\rangle \neq 0$, for all $i = 1, \dots, 5$, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^5 \eta'_i |\eta_i\rangle \langle\eta_i|\eta_k\rangle = \eta'_k |\eta_k\rangle \langle\eta_k| = \beta (\langle\omega_1|\eta_k\rangle) |\omega_1\rangle,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus the states $\rho_1(\Omega)$ are bound entangled if and only if $0 \leq \Omega < 1/5$.

Above-mentioned results about $\rho_1(\Omega)$ equally hold good for all other values of $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 5\}$. That it is true for $i = 2, 3, 4$, follows from the symmetry of the four elements $|\omega_1\rangle, |\omega_2\rangle, |\omega_3\rangle$, and $|\omega_4\rangle$ of the UPB of Eqn. (1) with respect to each other. Thus, for example, in order to study the properties of $\rho_2(\Omega)$, we need to interchange $|\omega_1\rangle$ and $|\omega_2\rangle$, which can be achieved (upto some unimportant global phases) by performing the following interchange on both the systems: $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |2\rangle$; in order to study the properties of $\rho_3(\Omega)$, we need to interchange $|\omega_1\rangle$ and $|\omega_3\rangle$, which can be achieved (upto some unimportant global phases) by performing first the swap operation, followed by the following interchange on the first system: $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |2\rangle$; in order to study the properties of $\rho_4(\Omega)$, we need to interchange $|\omega_1\rangle$ and $|\omega_4\rangle$, which can be achieved (upto some unimportant global phases) by performing first the swap operation, followed by the following interchange on the second system: $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |2\rangle$; Finally, in the same way, as described above, one can show that there exist exactly six product states, namely $|1\rangle \otimes |1\rangle, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \otimes |2\rangle, |0\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle), |2\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle + |2\rangle), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle + |2\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle$, and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle + |2\rangle) \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle + |2\rangle) = |\omega_5\rangle$, within the range of $\rho_5(\Omega)$. Therefore, the above-mentioned analysis for $\rho_1(\Omega)$ equally holds good for all other $\rho_i(\Omega)$'s.

III. BE STATES SATISFYING THE RC IN $d \otimes d$

We next generalize the preceding results for the case of $d \otimes d$. A direct proof of inseparability from the first principles, however, seems difficult to obtain, and instead we construct an entanglement witness to show inseparability. Let H be a finite dimensional Hilbert space of the form $H_A \otimes H_B$. For simplicity, we assume that $\dim H_A = \dim H_B = d$. Let $S = \{\omega_i = \psi_i^A \otimes \varphi_i^B\}_{i=1}^n$ be an UPB with cardinality $|S| = n$. Let the projector on H_S : the subspace spanned by the UPB, be denoted by

$$P_S = \sum_{i=1}^n |\omega_i\rangle \langle\omega_i| \quad (14)$$

Then the state proportional to the projector ($P_S^\perp$, say) on $H_S^\perp$ is given by:

$$\rho_{BE} = \frac{1}{D-n} (I - P_S) = \frac{P_S^\perp}{D-n} \quad (15)$$

where $D = d^2$. Thus ρ_{BE} is bound entangled.

Let G be a subset of S , where $1 \leq |G| \leq n = |S|$. Let P_G be the projector onto the Hilbert space H_G spanned by G . By following the same construction as in the previous section, we consider PPT states of the following form:

$$\rho_G(\Omega) = \frac{\Omega}{|G|} P_G + \frac{1-\Omega}{D-n} (I - P_S). \quad (16)$$

That is, we consider a class of PPT states by mixing a subset of the UPB's with ρ_{BE} , and then show that there always exists a $\mu > 0$, such that the states defined in Eq. (16) are bound entangled for all $0 < \Omega < \mu$. In order to show the inseparability of the states under consideration, we consider the following witness operator that was first stated in Ref [16] to detect entanglement of the edge states:

$$W = P_S - \lambda I, \quad (17)$$

where λ is chosen as the value specified in the following result:

Lemma 1 [15] Let $S = \{\omega_i = \psi_i^A \otimes \varphi_i^B\}_{i=1}^n$ be an UPB. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \min \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \phi_A \phi_B | \omega_i \rangle \langle \omega_i | \phi_A \phi_B \rangle \\ &= \min \sum_{i=1}^n |\langle \phi_A | \psi_i^A \rangle|^2 |\langle \phi_B | \varphi_i^B \rangle|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

over all pure states $|\phi_A\rangle \in H_A, |\phi_B\rangle \in H_B$, exists and is strictly larger than 0.

For highly symmetric UPB's, like the one given in Eq. (1), it is comparatively easier to calculate the value of λ . In Ref [15], it was also noted that a tight lower bound on λ can be explicitly calculated because of the high symmetry some of the UPB's. In fact, this lower bound has been calculated in [15] for the highly symmetric Pyramid UPB of $3 \otimes 3$. It is now straightforward to verify that the operator in Eq. (17) is a witness operator. First of all note that the operator is Hermitian. Next for any product state,

$$\langle \phi_A, \phi_B | W | \phi_A, \phi_B \rangle \geq 0 \quad (19)$$

where the equality is achieved by the product state for which $\langle \phi_A, \phi_B | P_S | \phi_A, \phi_B \rangle = \lambda$, and from lemma 1 we know such a product state exists. Therefore, for all separable states σ , $\text{Tr}(W\sigma) \geq 0$.

Now if we consider the state in Eq. (16), then we get

$$\text{Tr}(W\rho_G(\Omega)) = \text{Tr}\left(\frac{\Omega}{|G|} P_G - \lambda \rho_G(\Omega)\right) = (\Omega - \lambda).$$

Thus, $\text{Tr}(W\rho_G(\Omega)) < 0$ when $0 < \Omega < \lambda$, and hence, $\rho_G(\Omega)$ is inseparable for all $0 < \Omega < \lambda$. Note that the rank of $\rho_G(\Omega)$ is simply $(D-n)+|G|$. Therefore, rank of this particular class of PPT BE states ranges from $D-n+1$ to D for an UPB with n elements. Since $n \leq (D-4)$ and $|G| \geq 1$, $5 \leq \text{rank}(\rho_G(\Omega)) \leq D$. Unfortunately not much can be said whether the states, $\rho_G(\Omega)$, in general satisfy or violate the RC. However, as we show next, a subset of these BE states satisfy the RC in any dimension.

Definition 1 An UPB is said to be real (alternatively, an UPB is said to be with real elements) if all the coefficients of each of the elements of the UPB, with respect to the standard basis, are real.

Theorem 1 If S be an UPB with real elements in $d \otimes d$ and $|S| = n$, then the bound entangled states

$$\rho_G(\Omega) = \frac{\Omega}{|G|} P_G + (1-\Omega) \rho_{BE} \quad (20)$$

($0 < \Omega < \lambda$), satisfy the range criterion for all G , such that $|G| \geq (n-4)$.

Proof. Let H_{S-G} be the Hilbert space spanned by the elements remaining in the UPB S , after G being taken out from S . Let $H_{S-G}^\perp$ be the orthogonal complement. Since $|G| \geq n-4$, then $|S-G| \leq 4$. From theorem 3 of Ref. [17], it is sufficient to note that $H_{S-G}^\perp$ can be spanned by an orthogonal set of pure product states. Since S is an UPB with only real elements therefore the projectors P_G, P_S and $I - P_S$ are invariant under partial transposition. Hence the state $\rho_G(\Omega)$ is invariant under partial transposition. Now note that the range of $\rho_G(\Omega)$ is nothing but the subspace $H_{S-G}^\perp$ that admits an orthonormal product basis $\{|\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i\rangle : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$, where $N = D - (n - |G|)$. Thus we can write the projector $I - P_{S-G}$ on $H_{S-G}^\perp$ as

$$\begin{aligned} I - P_{S-G} &= \sum_{i=1}^N |\eta_i\rangle \langle \eta_i| \\ &= \frac{D-n}{1-\Omega} \left\{ \rho_G(\Omega) + \left[\frac{1-\Omega}{D-n} - \frac{\Omega}{|G|} \right] P_G \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $|\eta_i\rangle = |\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i\rangle$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Taking partial transposition (with respect to the second subsystem), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^N |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i| \otimes |\phi_i^*\rangle \langle \phi_i^*| \\ &= \frac{D-n}{1-\Omega} \left\{ \rho_G(\Omega) + \left[\frac{1-\Omega}{D-n} - \frac{\Omega}{|G|} \right] P_G \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i| \otimes |\phi_i\rangle \langle \phi_i| \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

as S is a real UPB. This implies that $\{|\psi_i\rangle \otimes |\phi_i^*\rangle : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ also spans $H_{S-G}^\perp$, and hence it also spans the range of $(\rho_G(\Omega))^{T_B}$ ($= \rho_G(\Omega)$). Therefore $\rho_G(\Omega)$ satisfies the range criterion. $\square$

Thus, the class of BE states, $\rho_G(\Omega)$, satisfy the RC and have ranks $(D - 4) \leq \text{rank}(\rho_G(\Omega)) \leq D$, i.e., the above construction provides classes of bound entangled states satisfying the RC of less than full rank, as well as, with full rank in any dimension.

Note that the condition in Theorem 1, which states that the underlying UPB consists of real elements, is crucial because it guarantees the invariance of the state under partial transposition. Thus, a natural question is how to construct real UPBs for any $n \geq 2d - 1$, where $2d - 1$ is the lower bound on the dimension of any UPB in $d \otimes d$. It was proved in Ref. [18] that if there is an UPB with minimum dimension then it can be realized with real elements. Unfortunately the proof is existential and not constructive. Following a suggestion by Smolin [19], here we show that for any bipartite system we can have a real UPB with dimension $D - 4$. We first construct it in $4 \otimes 4$ and as we will see the construction can be trivially generalized to any $d \otimes d$.

Consider the real UPB in $3 \otimes 3$ as provided in [17], and enumerated in Eq. (1). Let us now add the following states: $\{|03\rangle, |13\rangle, |23\rangle, |33\rangle, |30\rangle, |31\rangle, |32\rangle\}$ to the above set. Thus we have now a set S of twelve pairwise orthogonal pure product states of $4 \otimes 4$. It is now impossible to find out a product state $(a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle + c|2\rangle) \otimes (a'|0\rangle + b'|1\rangle + c'|2\rangle)$ in the orthogonal subspace $H_S^\perp$ of S , because S contains the UPB of Eq. (1). So any pure product state (if there is any), in $H_S^\perp$ must be of the form $(a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle + c|2\rangle + d|3\rangle) \otimes (a'|0\rangle + b'|1\rangle + c'|2\rangle + d'|3\rangle)$, where at least one of d and d' is non-zero. But at the same time, this later product state must have to be orthogonal to each of the product states $|03\rangle, |13\rangle, |23\rangle, |33\rangle, |30\rangle, |31\rangle, |32\rangle$, which, in turn, implies that both d and d' must be zero. Hence S is an UPB. As one can also see, the construction can be trivially generalized to $d \otimes d$, and after a proper counting, the number of elements turns out to be $D - 4$.

Finally, we note that it is surprising that only one witness is sufficient to show inseparability of such a wide range of PPT BE states. Naturally we would like to know if the witness is optimal in the sense whether it is the best witness to detect inseparability for our class of states. For example, given a separable state ρ_{sep} , we would like to know the maximum value of Ω for which the mixed state, $\Omega\rho_{sep} + (1 - \Omega)\rho_{BE}$ remains a BE state. For the $3 \otimes 3$ states discussed in Section II, we were able to exactly find the value of Ω below which the state is a BE state, where ρ_{sep} is a product state. Construction of a witness that will be optimal in this sense seems to be a difficult problem. However we show that in detecting entanglement of our class of states, the witness in Eq. (17) is not unique. In fact there can be infinitely many of them. Before we give an example of another witness let us prove a helpful lemma that bounds the inner-product between a pure entangled state and any product state.

Lemma 2 Let $|\Psi\rangle$ be a pure entangled state written in

the Schmidt form:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_j |j\rangle_A |j\rangle_B \quad (23)$$

where the Schmidt rank $k, 2 \leq k \leq d$. Let $|\gamma|^2 = \max \{|\gamma_j|^2\}$. Then for all normalized product states $|\phi_A\rangle \otimes |\phi_B\rangle$,

$$|\langle\Psi|\phi_A \otimes \phi_B\rangle|^2 \leq |\gamma|^2 \quad (24)$$

Proof. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle\Psi|\phi_A \otimes \phi_B\rangle|^2 &= \left| \sum \gamma_j \langle\phi_A|j\rangle \langle\phi_B|j\rangle \right|^2 \\ &\leq |\gamma|^2 \left| \sum \langle\phi_A|j\rangle \langle\phi_B|j\rangle \right|^2 \leq |\gamma|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

and using Schwartz inequality and the facts that $\sum |\langle\phi_A|j\rangle|^2 \leq 1$, $|\sum \langle\phi_A|j\rangle|^2 \leq 1$. $\square$

Let $|\Phi\rangle$ be a pure entangled state belonging to $H_S^\perp$, where S is an UPB. Let $|\gamma|^2$ be the absolute square of it's largest Schmidt coefficient. Consider now the Hermitian operator:

$$W = P_S - \frac{\lambda}{|\gamma|^2} |\Phi\rangle \langle\Phi| \quad (26)$$

Then from Lemmas 1 and 2 it follows that for all product state $|\phi_A\rangle \otimes |\phi_B\rangle \in H_A \otimes H_B$, $\text{Tr}(W |\phi_A\rangle \langle\phi_A| \otimes |\phi_B\rangle \langle\phi_B|) \geq 0$. Consider the states defined by Eq. 16. It follows that

$$\text{Tr}(W\rho) = \frac{\Omega \left[|\gamma|^2 (D - n) + \lambda \right] - \lambda}{|\gamma|^2 (D - n)} \quad (27)$$

This is negative when

$$\Omega < \frac{\lambda}{|\gamma|^2 (D - n) + \lambda} \quad (28)$$

Let us note that the choice of any pure state $|\Phi\rangle$, that belongs to $H_S^\perp$, works for our construction. However we also wish to maximize the range over which the state is bound entangled. For example, the above-mentioned entanglement witness $W = P_S - \frac{\lambda}{|\gamma|^2} |\Phi\rangle \langle\Phi|$, will be better than the entanglement witness given in (17) (so far as detection of the bound entanglement in the state of equation (16) is concerned), provided $|\gamma|^2 < \frac{1-\lambda}{D-n}$. This can be done by doing a minimization over the set of all $|\gamma|^2$ and thereby choosing the corresponding pure state. We leave the construction of such witnesses as a future research problem.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have studied PPT BE states for bipartite quantum systems, and have provided a systematic method of obtaining bound entangled states in any bipartite system with ranks ranging from five to full rank. We have also constructed a class of entanglement witness that detects the inseparability of our class of PPT states. We have also shown that a subset of our class having less than full rank satisfies the range criterion. This enabled us to provide a qualitative classification of PPT BE states based on rank and satisfaction/violation of range criterion. For a very specific class of states (i.e., in $3 \otimes 3$) we have been

able to prove the inseparability from the first principles by showing that the bound entangled states cannot be written as a convex combination of the product states in its support even though the support admits an orthogonal product basis and more product states than the dimension of the support.

Acknowledgement : Part of this work was done when S. B. was a post-doctoral fellow at Electrical Engineering Department, UCLA, and S. G. was visiting this department. This work was sponsored in part by the U.S. Army Research Office/DARPA under contract/grant number DAAD 19-00-1-0172, and in part by the NSF under contract number CCF-0432296.

-
- [1] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000).mmmm
 - [2] For an excellent introduction: A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, (The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers).
 - [3] P. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **232** (1997) 333.
 - [4] D. Bruss and A. Peres, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 030301 (R) (2000).
 - [5] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999) 5385.
 - [6] P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999) 1056.
 - [7] W. Dür, J. I. Cirac, M. Lewenstein, and D. Bruß, *Phys. Rev. A* **61** (2000) 062313; D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and A. V. Thapliyal, *Phys. Rev. A* **61** (2000) 062312; S. Bandyopadhyay and V. P. Roychowdhury, *Phys. Rev. A* **68** (2003) 022319
 - [8] See, for example, D. Bruß, J. I. Cirac, P. Horodecki, F. Hulpke, B. Kraus, M. Lewenstein, A. Sanpera, *J. Mod. Opt.* **49** (2002) 1399, for a general review.
 - [9] L. Gurvits, *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ACM Press, New York (2003), pp. 10-19.
 - [10] A. C. Doherty, P. A. Parrilo, F. M. Spedalieri, *Phys. Rev. A* **69** (2004) 022308
 - [11] L. Vandenberghe and S. Boyd, URL <http://www.stanford.edu/~boyd/cvxbook.html>
 - [12] D. Perez-Garcia, *Phys. Lett. A* **330** (2004) 149
 - [13] O. Rudolph, *J. Phys. A* **33** (2000) 3951
 - [14] K. G. H. Vollbrecht and M. M. Wolf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** (2002) 247901
 - [15] B. M. Terhal, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **323** (2000) 61
 - [16] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, J. I. Cirac, and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **62** (2000) 052310
 - [17] D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and B. M. Terhal, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **238** (2003) 379
 - [18] N. Alon and L. Lovász, *J. Combinatorial Theory, Ser. A* **95** (2001) 169
 - [19] Private correspondence